

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the comments in the Office Action, which has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that all issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

The Applicant has amended the claim set. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claim set are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

Drawings

The Examiner objected in the final Office Action that the drawings fail to show "at least one printhead integrated circuit that is positioned in the outlet to span the printing path, the, or each, printhead integrated circuit defining at least three sets of inlet apertures, each set of inlet apertures being aligned with the respective ink path".

The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the drawings fail to describe the above-mentioned feature. The Applicant draws attention to Figure 14 where the printhead 102 includes a series of apertures 128 defined therein for carriage of the ink to the front surface of the printhead for printing. This is described from line 29 through to line 33 of page 7 of the specification.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the drawing objection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 8 as being unpatentable over Suzuki (US Patent No. 5,847,836) in view of Duffield *et al.* (US Patent No. 4,432,005).

In the final Office Action the Applicant amended claim 1 with the subject matter of claim 7. The Applicant argued that there is no teaching or suggestion by Suzuki in view of Duffield *et al* of "in which a sponge like member is positioned in each ink reservoir to store the ink while inhibiting agitation of ink during general use of the camera system". The Examiner has argued in the Advisory Action that it is not clear whether the sponge like member is

positioned in each of the "at least three ink reservoirs" or in the ink reservoir assembly. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claim is unclear.

However, in order to expedite the allowance of the current application, the Applicant has made it absolutely clear in claim 1 that a sponge like member is positioned in each of the at least three ink reservoirs. The Applicant respectfully submits that Suzuki in view of Duffield et al fails to disclose the claim limitation of "in which a sponge like member is positioned in each of the at least three ink reservoirs to store the ink while inhibiting agitation of ink during general use of the camera system". The Applicant refers to chamber 38 and wick 46 of Duffield et al which are designed to collect waste ink that is dispensed downstream from the ink reservoirs 8a, 8b and 8c where it is clear that the sponge like member is not located in ink reservoirs 8a, 8b or 8c.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762